

Appl. No. 09/903,217
Am. Dated December 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated September 8, 2005 and the Advisory Action dated December 13, 2005 is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 22, 24-30, and 32-54 have been allowed. Claims 8 and 18 have been objected to. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 have been cancelled with the filing of this amendment. As such, claims 8, 18, 21, 22, 24-30, and 32-54 are currently pending.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Elliot et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,091), herein after "Elliot." Claims 2, 5, 12, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot as applied to claims 1, 4, 11, and 14 above, and further in view of Naranjo et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0076816), herein after "Naranjo." Although the Applicant believes that these claims are each allowable over the cited art, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 have been cancelled in a sincere effort to further the prosecution of the instant patent application. The cancellation of these claims is not to be construed as an agreement with the Examiner's rejections, as the Applicant does not in fact agree with the Examiner's rejections. The Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce the cancelled claims, as well as claims of a similar scope, in a future divisional, continuation-in-part, or other continuing patent application.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 21, 22, 24-30, and 32-54 have been allowed. Claims 8 and 18 have been objected to. The Examiner has objected to claims 8 and 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that claims 8 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant believes that the independent claims from which claims 8 and 18 depend are allowable over the cited art. However, purely to expedite prosecution, claims 8 and 18 have been rewritten in independent form.

Appl. No. 09/903,217
Amd. Dated December 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 868-4096.

Respectfully submitted,


Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

AKA CHAN LLP
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710
Santa Clara, California 95050
Phone: 408.868.4096
Fax: 408.608.1599